

whether we are going to face an adjournment request later.

Mr. LOTT. Well, could I inquire if the leader would be willing to give us consent for our committees to meet, if we could go ahead and lock in a unanimous consent-agreement, or an agreement on how long you all would like to go tonight? Would the Senator like to respond to that?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we discussed this matter in the caucus. I think it was unanimous in the caucus that committees would not meet this afternoon, because we really need to have attention focused on this issue. I am afraid I am not able to give that agreement to the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could say, then, I would like to—and I will talk to the Senators about how we do this—with their cooperation, and I am talking about not just committee meetings, because we will do what we need to do there. But when we begin the debate or comments other Senators are going to make, we will talk with you about how much time we think we need and how we will do that. It is my inclination today to try to get it worked out, where we could have an understanding, an understood period of time, and to not go with a motion to adjourn.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator would agree to the proposition that we not propose a motion to adjourn the Senate without agreement obtained with the minority leader for such a motion.

Mr. LOTT. You know, I am asking here for some process whereby the Senators from the various States would have a chance to make comments for a specified period of time. I asked for 10 minutes. Do you want me to expand that to 15?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think there are Senators who wish to speak longer than 10 minutes. Whether it is at the first opportunity or whether they have the opportunity to come back, that is a concern. But I share the concern expressed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LOTT. If I could—excuse me for interrupting you, but we are going to have an opportunity for them to speak now and speak again later. And we will have to work out the process to do that.

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, what is the assurance that a Senator would not be precluded from giving a second speech? Because, as the majority has outlined this proposal, as I understand it, a Senator would be able to speak 10 minutes or 15 minutes, but then would be precluded from speaking again, unless the majority leader would alter his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LOTT. I believe if we get another consent, that that would not apply. Of course, the way the Senate works, if a Senator asks for a specified period of time to speak, that usually is acquiesced to.

Here is the alternative. If you like, I'll just keep talking here. We can go

right on until some other time here in the afternoon. But I would like to have a free-flowing discussion, so I would like to do it in an orderly way.

I asked unanimous consent, and then we will get an agreement, I presume later on, that we will have an extended period of time for debate during which Senators will be able to speak for extended periods of time.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DASCHLE. Would he entertain a unanimous-consent request which would say we would not adjourn without the consent of both leaders tonight? Because I think, if that were the case, then there would be no objection on this side to working through whatever schedule may accommodate speakers on both sides.

Mr. LOTT. It is my intent, Mr. President, to work with the leader and get an agreement on what time will be needed. I would like to do that. I prefer not to move for adjournment. I think we could work that out. I am indicating to you I would like for you to be able to have that time tonight. But I have been asked for three different things to agree to. I asked for one thing in return, and that's for committees to meet. I am going to have to go through a parliamentary procedure here in order for committees to be able to meet.

Let us do this. Let us talk while others are talking and we could work this out. I think there is no question we can get that done.

Mr. President, I renew my request that the Senators that I outlined be allowed to speak for 10 minutes and that I be recognized at the end of this list, at which time, if there are other Senators who wish to speak, they will be recognized or we will work out an order so the debate can continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Leader, I say to you I would be forced to object if there is no assurance that the rights of this Senator and other Senators will be protected. Because, as the Senator has outlined, the Senator would be able to speak perhaps 10 or 15 minutes and that's it, under this formulation.

Mr. LOTT. I am saying to the Senator from North Dakota, I would like to be able to work with him to do that. I intend to do that. We will talk and we will make that agreement. We will make it in a request at a period of time after we have had some of these speeches so we can talk.

I don't know exactly what you all are thinking about or what you want, but there is no desire to cut the Senator from North Dakota off today. I want him to be able to make his case. I am going to work with you to do that, and I think the record will show I have done that sort of thing in the past. I am telling you here, now, we are going to find a way for you to be able to

make the speech you want to make. What more can you ask of me now? And then, we will talk that through while others are speaking.

Mr. CONRAD. I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have five unanimous consent requests for subcommittees to meet during today's session of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent these request be agreed to en bloc and that each request be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DASCHLE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, my consent request was for the Armed Services Committee to meet on S. 450, the Department of Defense authorization bill. They are the Subcommittees on Airland Forces, Strategic Forces, Seapower, Acquisition, and Technology. Also, for the Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs and the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations to meet on some very important issues, with witnesses to be Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, Mr. William J. Bennett, and Michael J. Horowitz of the Hudson Institute, Father Keith Roderick of the Coalition for the Defense of Human Rights, prepared and waiting to testify before that committee.

The second panel includes Col. Sharbel Barakat, a witness from Iran, and an anonymous witness from Pakistan.

In addition to that, we asked for the Science, Technology and Space Subcommittee, Committee of Commerce, to meet with regard to NASA's international space program, which we have been working feverishly to make work, with other countries including Russia.

Those are the committees that are prepared to meet this afternoon. They have witnesses lined up of both parties and a variety of positions. That has been objected to. I thought it was appropriate we put in the RECORD that objection is heard.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk continued the call of the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next hour be equally divided between Senators LOTT and DASCHLE and, at the end of that hour, that Senator LOTT be recognized to move to adjourn.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I can inquire of the Senator from South Dakota, is it his desire that we not have any further debate at this time?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is the desire on the part of many of our colleagues to speak longer than the time allotted in the unanimous consent request, and it is certainly the desire of our colleagues not to allow the Senator the opportunity to adjourn the Senate. For that reason, I am compelled to object.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have very important committee work that needs to be done. As the Senate knows, the bulk of the work and the writing that goes on in the Senate does occur in committees at the hearings and markups. We have a very important markup now that we need to get done in the Armed Services Committee. The defense of our country is, obviously, something we want to pay very close attention to. We have less than a week in which the Armed Services Committee needs to complete its work.

I would prefer that we get an agreement that the Armed Services Committee, as is always—almost always—the case, be allowed to meet with these other committees. I understand the Senator has a problem, some objections from his conference. I also would prefer that we have an hour of debate equally divided so that Senators who have been patiently waiting for quite some time can be heard, including Senators here now, and Senator GRAMS of Minnesota who has been waiting to be heard.

I also had hoped that we could work together and get a time worked out whereby we could have extended debate tonight. It doesn't appear that we can work that out. So, I would be prepared to proceed at this time.

Does the Senator have any other comment he would like to make before I propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader mentions the defense markup. I also remind him, as he is very aware, there is money in this supplemental for our troops in Bosnia. Time is running out there, too. There is virtually no time left for us to get the supplemental assistance to the troops in Bosnia. It sends a terrible message to them not to address this legislation more successfully than we have.

I can't think of anything more important in that regard, not only to ad-

dress the disaster victims but to address the troops in Bosnia, to address all of those who are waiting for some sign that we understand how difficult their circumstances are, including people defending our country in faraway lands.

So, I am compelled to object, and I only hope that at some point in the not-too-distant future, we are going to be able to resolve this matter, because they can't wait any longer.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I also had hoped that we would be able to work out an agreement where there wouldn't be objection to my motion to proceed to the Birth Defects Prevention Act—this is broadly supported legislation; I don't see how there could be objection to it—while we continue to work to find ways to move other legislation while committees are meeting.

I understand the pressure that Senators feel on both sides of the aisle on other issues, but I don't see why that should cause us to halt or prevent us from taking up a very noncontroversial, broadly bipartisan supported legislation like S. 419.

I am also hopeful that this week we could take up the adoption legislation that we have been holding in abeyance for a week. And the Senator from Ohio, Senator DEWINE, has done very good work on that and I believe is prepared to spend time on the floor when we call up that legislation. I hope it will be in the next coming days.

Let us be clear about what this legislation does, the birth defects legislation. No one in this body needs to be told that birth defects are the leading cause of infant mortality in this country. They are directly responsible for one 1 of every 5 infant deaths. Here is a chance to do something about that, not in a week, not in a month, but this afternoon with, I am sure, not very long debate but enough debate so that the issue can be properly addressed.

We have spent the last couple of hours or so talking about other issues other than this bill which we had hoped to call up and begin debating.

No one needs to be told that every year some 150,000 infants are born with a serious birth defect. Here is a chance to do something about that.

Here is a chance to foster the most effective—and, by the way, the most cost effective—ways to prevent birth defects.

We now know that folic acid vitamin supplements can prevent spina bifida. We know that programs to promote avoidance of alcohol, especially early in pregnancy, can dramatically reduce a whole range of birth defects.

We want to get that knowledge out to those who need it. Senator BOND's bill would do that through regional research programs to identify the causes of clusters of birth defects.

His bill, which, by the way, is cosponsored by more than a score of Senators on both sides of the aisle, makes the Centers for Disease Control the lead agency for surveillance of birth defects

and prevention activities to reduce their incidence.

His bill proposes grants to public and nonprofit groups to foster public awareness in ways to prevent birth defects. It would also set up a National Information Clearinghouse on Birth Defects.

This legislation, to which there has been objection, is really important and is endorsed by a wide range of groups: The American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Association of Mental Retardation, the American Hospital Association, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the American Public Health Association, the Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists, the March of Dimes, the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the National Perinatal Association, the National Easter Seal Society, and the Spina Bifida Association.

On their behalf, I again renew my concern. There has been objection to this bill. On their behalf, I ask that we confer and see if we cannot find a way to bring up this legislation, if not today, tomorrow, while we work on other solutions to other problems.

It is not a partisan issue. It is not controversial. And all that Senator BOND has sought has received support across the political lines and he has urged that we take it up this week. It would be different if it were controversial or if this were a partisan issue. But it is not. It is one that I think we certainly need to get passed. And a lot of good work has gone into it. And I will continue to ask that it be brought up this week. And I will certainly confer with the leaders on the other side of the aisle as we try to find a way to bring to the consideration of the Senate legislation that would help with this very serious and very difficult problem of birth defects.

So now I ask—

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield for a comment or question from the Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. As I indicated earlier, Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of this legislation. So obviously I am very supportive of it. But it should be noted this legislation has not had a hearing, it has not been marked up in the committee.

The majority leader—and it is his right to do so—is discharging the committee to bring this bill to the floor. Now, that is an abnormal procedure. That is not something we do every day. Yet the distinguished majority leader has seen fit to bring this bill to the floor without an official markup, and then to amend it with an amendment that we only saw late yesterday. And so it is really not normal legislative procedure to consider a bill of this import, even though there may not be much controversy associated with it, to discharge it, to amend it with an amendment nobody has seen, and to move in this process.

So it is not only our concern for the disaster legislation but our concern for